

be prevented from or punished for doing the job we ask them to do?

Violence against police officers—always a danger—is up. The sickening scene of protesters shouting “death to police” outside a hospital where two ambushed law enforcement officers were fighting for their lives has to be emblazoned on the minds of police officers nationwide. Again I ask, why would anyone want to join the police under these conditions?

The “defund the police” movement is not only costing us many good officers today, it has depleted the pool of good officers for the future, and that is a travesty.

The unfortunate truth is, the Democrats bear a substantial amount of responsibility for the situation we find ourselves in because this is a party that either actively contributed to the “defund the police” rhetoric or implicitly endorsed it by largely staying silent, not to mention the less-than-censorious attitude the Democrats frequently displayed when it came to the violence and property destruction of last summer and the past year.

California Representative MAXINE WATERS said protesters in Minneapolis this April should “get more confrontational” should the verdict in the Chauvin trial not go their way.

Far-left Members of the House of Representatives spent the past year making statements like these:

Policing in our country is inherently and intentionally racist.

No more policing, incarceration, and militarization.

Now, more mainstream Democrats have become wise to the fact that their party’s association with the “defund the police” movement may threaten their electoral chances next year. As polling demonstrated, Americans are squarely against the idea of defunding the police. So the President and other Democratic leaders all of a sudden announced their concern about surging crime, but they are still trying to have their cake and eat it, too, because missing from their messaging is any real condemnation of “defund the police” rhetoric and the terrible toll it has taken on our cities and police departments.

In fact, President Biden, who is currently trying to reinvent himself as tough on crime, filled key roles in the Department of Justice with individuals who have gone on record with their support for defunding the police. President Biden’s Secretary of Labor actually cut police funding while serving as Boston’s mayor, and his Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has suggested that we should consider decreasing police budgets.

Democrats’ actual crime-fighting plans are long on punishing gun dealers and gun manufacturers and short on actually going after criminals. The President’s nominee to head the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives seems more interested in targeting law-abiding gun owners than in dealing with the surge in gun crime.

I have one last point to make about the “defund the police” movement, and that is its fundamental injustice. Are there bad police officers out there? Of course there are. There are bad teachers out there, too, and bad social workers and bad small businessmen. But just as it would be outrageous to demonize all teachers because of a few bad apples in their profession, it is outrageous to demonize the hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women defending public safety in this country because of a handful of bad officers.

We owe our men and women in law enforcement a great debt—a debt we can’t even fully comprehend. These men and women go out and risk their lives every day of the week, every month of the year, to keep us safe. But they don’t just risk their lives; they also bear a heavy physical and emotional burden. Most of us go about our daily lives without having to confront much evil because our law enforcement officers go out every day to confront it for us. They confront violence so that we don’t have to, and they pay a price. It is tough to have to see evil on a daily basis, to spend years rescuing children who are in trouble or supporting victims of violence or bringing rapists to justice, but it is a price most of them are glad to pay. They signed up to protect the innocent, to keep the public safe and evil at bay, and they are proud to do it. We owe them and their families our profound gratitude.

It is abhorrent that anti-police rhetoric has become such an accepted part of our national conversation and has been winked at or endorsed by so many Democratic leaders. We owe our police officers much better.

I hope the belated realization among some that police officers are essential to keeping our communities safe will spell the end of the “defund the police” movement. It is time to focus on protecting public safety and honoring men and women who spend every day working to promote it.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON LIANG NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Liang nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 264 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Blunt	Burr
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell
Blumenthal	Brown	Capito

Cardin	Kaine	Rosen
Carper	Kelly	Rounds
Casey	King	Sanders
Collins	Klobuchar	Schatz
Coons	Leahy	Schumer
Cornyn	Lujan	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Shaheen
Crapo	Markey	Sinema
Daines	McConnell	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Stabenow
Durbin	Moran	Tester
Feinstein	Murkowski	Thune
Fischer	Murphy	Toomey
Gillibrand	Murray	Van Hollen
Grassley	Ossoff	Warner
Hassan	Padilla	Warnock
Heinrich	Peters	Warren
Hickenlooper	Portman	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Wyden
Johnson	Romney	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Hagerty	Menendez
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeben	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Tillis
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Donald Michael Remy, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Remy nomination?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Baldwin	Duckworth	Marshall
Barrasso	Durbin	McConnell
Bennet	Feinstein	Menendez
Blumenthal	Fischer	Merkley
Blunt	Gillibrand	Moran
Booker	Grassley	Murkowski
Boozman	Hassan	Murphy
Braun	Heinrich	Murray
Brown	Hickenlooper	Ossoff
Burr	Hirono	Padilla
Cantwell	Hoeben	Paul
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Peters
Cardin	Inhofe	Portman
Carper	Johnson	Reed
Casey	Kaine	Risch
Cassidy	Kelly	Romney
Collins	Kennedy	Rosen
Coons	King	Rounds
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Rubio
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Sanders
Cotton	Lee	Sasse
Cramer	Lujan	Schatz
Crapo	Lummis	Schumer
Cruz	Manchin	Scott (SC)
Daines	Markey	Shaheen

Sinema	Tillis	Warren
Smith	Toomey	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Tuberville	Wyden
Sullivan	Van Hollen	Young
Tester	Warner	
Thune	Warnock	

NAYS—8

Blackburn	Hawley	Shelby
Ernst	Lankford	Wicker
Hagerty	Scott (FL)	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 195, Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Margaret Wood Hassan, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Ben Ray Lujan, Jack Reed, Chris Van Hollen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 246.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 246, Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, of New York, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Lujan, Jeff Merkley, Raphael Warnock, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Patrick J. Leahy, Tammy Baldwin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, John Hickenlooper, Angus S. King, Jr., Tammy Duckworth, Patty Murray.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for cloture motions filed today, Thursday, July 15, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The senior Senator from Texas.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, our Democratic colleagues have begun to lay out the groundwork for a partisan reconciliation bill totaling \$3.5 trillion—what used to be an absolutely astonishing amount of money.

We don't have many details about how that money could be spent, but based on everything we have heard from President Biden and our Democratic colleagues over recent months, there are some safe assumptions: Medicare expansion, Green New Deal-era climate initiatives, and a range of free programs that we know aren't free at all—college, childcare; you name it.

To pay for these runaway spending habits, our Democratic colleagues will lean on job-killing tax increases and excessive borrowing from future generations. As a reminder, this is only one-half of the dual-track strategy they are pushing this month. The other

half is more than \$1 trillion worth of infrastructure.

And I would note that while there is strong bipartisan support for an infrastructure bill, that the Democratic leader is apparently intending to file for cloture on a motion to proceed to a bill that hasn't even been written yet, much less had a Congressional Budget Office score to see whether the pay-fors are meaningful or phony.

As I see it, our friends on the other side have made it even more difficult to convince our colleagues, let alone the American people, that this type of spending is necessary. After all, they have already developed a spotty record this year. At a time when our debts were piling up, they added up even more unnecessary spending.

Back in March, Democrats spent nearly \$2 trillion without the support of a single Republican. They claimed this was all in the name of COVID-19 relief, even though less than 10 percent directly supported our pandemic response. The rest was a grab bag of irresponsible spending.

One case in point is the blue State bailout. Democrats spent \$350 billion more in aid to State and local governments, many of which were not even facing any sort of budget shortfalls. Democrats said the jobs of everybody from police officers to teachers would be in jeopardy without this funding.

Republicans offered that this huge sum of funding wasn't needed since many States were not operating in the red. Even liberal economists and non-partisan groups, like the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, agreed.

But as the old saying goes, time tells all. And it didn't take much time for us to see how completely unnecessary this \$350 billion payout was. Take California as an example. California has more than \$100 billion budget surplus. That is with a capital "B." Governor Newsom is using that money to dole out stimulus checks and provide medical coverage for undocumented immigrants.

New Jersey has had so much extra cash lying around that it has made its first full payment into the State's pension system in more than 25 years. But they didn't stop there. It exceeded that payment by more than half a billion dollars.

This was exactly the kind of reckless spending of supposed COVID-19 dollars borrowed against future generations that we advocated against because we saw a tidal wave of funding going to States that were not even operating in the red.

One recent POLITICO article read:

State Faced Financial Ruin. Now they're swimming in cash.

The Wall Street Journal Editorial Board asked: "Didn't States Say They Were Broke?"

At a time when our spending already mirrored wartime expenses, Democrats handed States piles of cash to erase debts and add to rainy-day funds, not to provide for COVID-19 relief.